

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,330	09/30/2003	Mark A. Chovan	11703.4	5310
7590 09/16/2004			EXAMINER	
Michael F. Krieger			MAI, HUY KIM	
Kirton & McConkie Suite 1800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
60 East South Temple			2873	
Salt Lake City, UT 84111			DATE MAILED: 09/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	A ti At At	A 1: 4/ -)			
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary	10/675,330	CHOVAN ET AL			
Onice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this communication and	Huy K. Mai	2873			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 Seconds</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under Expression is the practice of the pract	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>25</u> is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3-10,12-18,20,21,23 and 24</u> is/are ref. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>2,11,19 and 22</u> is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration. ejected.				
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	are: a) accepted or b) object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/675,330

Art Unit: 2873

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

1. The declaration filed on Sept. 30, 2003 is acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1,3-10,12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis et al (5,307,523) in view of Frank (4,162,542).

Lewis et al discloses a protective eyewear 11, comprising first and second eyepieces 12,13 formed of uniform material, wherein said first and second eyepieces each comprise an eye cup and a lens integrally formed with said eye cup to comprise a unitary eye cup/lens combination, and a nose bridge coupled to each of said first and second eyepieces, said nose bridge comprising first and second supports and an elevated rise that reduces blockage of ultraviolet light from the nose and brow area of a wearer when attached, However Lewis et al does not discloses the nose bridge removably coupled to the eyepieces as claimed. Frank discloses eye protectors wherein the nose bridge removably coupled to the eyepieces for the same purposes of as disclosed by the applicant. Since Lewis et al and Frank are both from the same filed of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Frank would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Lewis et al.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the nose bridge in the Lewis et al reference by forming a nose

Art Unit: 2873

bridge removably coupled to the eye pieces in light of Frank's teachings for the same purpose as disclosed by Frank as the same as the applicant does.

4. Claims 20,21,23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis et al in view of Frank as applied to claims 1,3-10,12-18 above, and further in view of Haslbeck (4,348,775).

The claimed invention in claims 20,21,23,24 are disclosed by Lewis et al in view of frank wherein the nose bridge removably coupled to the eye pieces instead of the adjusting eyepieces as now claimed. Haslbeck discloses the eye protector two adjusting eye pieces relative to the nose bridge for the purpose of adjusting the eye pieces relative to the nose bridge. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in this art to modify the removable eye pieces of Lewis et al in view of Frank by forming removable adjusting eye pieces in light of Haslbeck's teaching for removably adjusting the eye pieces individually as the same as the applicant does.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claim 25 is allowed.
- 6. Claims 2,11,19,22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy Mai whose telephone number is (571) 272-2334. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 a.m.-4:30 p.m.).

Application/Control Number: 10/675,330 Page 4

Art Unit: 2873

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Georgia Y. Epps can be reached on (571) 272-2328. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1562.

Huy Mai

Primary Examiner Art Unit 2873

HKM/

September 11, 2004